

**WSDOT/ACEC Project Delivery Team Meeting
Olympic Region Boardroom, Tumwater, WA
September 10, 2004**

Attendees

Ken Smith - Team Co-Chair
Duncan Findlay - Team Co-Chair
Pasco Bakotich (absent)
Kirk Berg
Doyle Dilley
Richard (Rick) Door
Russ East (absent)
Mary Holland
Mike Horton
Mike Mariano (absent)
Keith Metcalf
Amir Rasaie
Lisa Reid (absent)
Rick Smith
John Villager
Karl Winterstein (absent)
John Wynands (attending for Pasco Bakotich)
Adele McCormick – Recorder

Introductions and Agenda Review

Ken Smith

WSDOT/ACEC Project Delivery Team Website

Adele McCormick

Adele McCormick presented the WSDOT/ACEC Project Delivery Team website. The website is not currently password protected. The team discussed whether there is a problem keeping the website open to everyone, and decided there is no need to protect the website. ACEC Washington will include a link to this website from their website. The WSDOT/ACEC Project Delivery Team website address is:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/partners/projectdelivery/>

Northwest Region Decision Matrix

Amir Rasaie

Handout: Partial List of Northwest Region Matrix for Action, Approval, Signature or Certification (September 2004)

Amir Rasaie went through the handout to explain the format. This decision matrix should be compatible with both the Design and Construction manuals and shows who has signature and delegation authority within the region.

When the *Design Manual* states that the region has approval authority, there is sometimes confusion on the part of contractors regarding specifically who in the region has that authority. The developer or consultant isn't usually working directly with the approving authority.

This matrix should help demystify the approval process in Northwest Region.

Question: All the approvals and the turnaround time to get them is a lengthy process. Is there a way to streamline this process?

Handout: *Construction Manual* 1-33
Change Order Checklist

This handout shows the process to gain verbal approval from the executing authority so that work can proceed prior to issuance of a written change order. This may help the developer during construction. However, we need to address the scoping phase and the design phase to streamline the loops that currently exist and make the processes more efficient.

What we are talking about here is time. Time is money for both WSDOT and consultants.

Is it this team's mission to slice this into smaller sections and address efficiencies in them?

Do the other regions have a similar document to the one Amir has provided from Northwest Region? Some of the regions are smaller and don't have such a complex structure. When there are fewer people and they stay in the same positions over time, the process isn't so complex.

Handout: *Design Manual* 330-10
Design Documentation, Approval, and Process Review

When there are multiple approval or concurrence requirements within the region and/or Headquarters, it is a lengthy process, especially when everyone feels it necessary to make comments. Northwest Region took what was in the *Design Manual* and set out specifically who within the region has to give approval.

Part of the reason this was brought up is that the consultants deal mostly one-on-one with the project managers/engineers. A common problem is that the consultant thinks the project has been reviewed and then they discover it still has to go through the approving

authority. It would help if once the approval and comments are together, this could be channeled through one person who works with the consultant/developer.

Once the region approves, then the project gets sent to Headquarters for approval. From Headquarters, it is sent to FHWA. At all of these points comments can/will be sent back. Eastern Region works hand-in-hand with Headquarters so when they send it in for concurrence, they already know they will get it.

Northwest Region has brought FHWA up front in the process so there are no surprises when FHWA sends their comments back. FHWA wants to have the final say at the end, so they are reluctant to come to the table up front. There is a document that has put in some intermediate steps that should help. **This should be an agenda item for a future meeting.**

The right of way acquisition process should be included in this scrutiny. Is this the vehicle for examining the federal requirements vs. the WACs? The WACs and the Federal process (CFRs) are almost word-for-word. But now that you know you have to do appraisals, how do you do it? This is what we can look at. There is a Headquarters/Northwest Region right of way excursion that is being examined right now. It is not a team charter – rather an attempt to make the process more expeditious in Northwest Region. It is an effective vehicle to start to consider some of the processes. Northwest Region has a process change where the authority for sending a parcel through condemnation is in the region instead of Headquarters. Headquarters is being kept apprised of what is going on, but they are not involved in the decision and negotiations.

Action Item: Rick Smith, Mike Horton, and Amir Rasaie will bring reports back to this group. Then we can decide if there are areas this group can work through.

Change Request Format and Implementation Plans **Ken Smith and Duncan Findlay**

The team reviewed the change request proposal form. We will rework the form in either MS Word or a web-based format. Approval from team co-sponsors will only be included at the end of the form.

Intersection/Channelization Plan for Approval Checklist **Ken Smith and Mike Horton**

The team discussed what should be included or deleted from the checklist. This checklist helps because everyone knows what is necessary and submits the needed information.

Action Item: Ken will send out this entire recommendation with revised checklist in the new format before the next meeting.

When we submit this change request form, how do we quantify the savings for the recommendation?

Brainstorm Ideas

Duncan Findlay

There is another category of topics that we should consider that have the potential for impacting project delivery costs by more than 10 percent in the aggregate. This may affect agreements and construction, and includes such diverse things as bonding and insurance, OCIP (Owner Controlled Insurance Programs), contract contingency, labor, labor unions, taxes, etc. This group may want to look at some of these.

Handout: Executive Summary for a Single Project OCIP

Owner controlled Insurance Program (OCIP) – It might be worthwhile to start thinking about what these things are. We might want to invite someone to come in to talk to us about OCIP.

There are some design-build projects coming from UCO out of the Nickel package. We need to make some recommendations about OCIPs soon if we are going to address them.

Is MPD (Managing Project Delivery) utilized by WSDOT? To what extent has it been implemented and how is it used? Is there any reason for this group to look at this?

WSDOT still believes in MPD and is endorsing and pushing it. There has been a lot of success from using it. We are trying to get our project engineers and managers to accept it as a process. The issue is usually “it takes a lot of time.” It is part of the consultant utilization manual. It is the only method acceptable by the state as a payment process for scoping. The intent is for all those involved to become a team. Yes, WSDOT is trying to implement it; yes it is policy. Recommendations from this group could be methodologies for implementing it to gain time and money savings.

A *Design Manual* chapter has followed the executive order to implement MPD. It is still growing. Perhaps a subgroup of our team should research where it has worked, how it has worked, etc., and bring that to the team.

JLARC is going to look at how we’ve managed eight selected projects around the state. They will come out with recommendations by the end of the year on how we are doing with project management. We should defer action on this item until JLARC’s audit information comes out. Then we will know what they find and where we should be going with this. **This should be a future action item after their report comes out.**

Categorize Brainstorm Items

Ken Smith

Most of the items on the brainstorm list fall into the Managing Project Delivery (A) group. How do we work through them and when?

We can screen the “A” list into long- or short-term items.

Was this list more a list of complaints rather than a list that we should use? Perhaps it should be a list to keep in mind, but the list of work items might be different.

We are talking about the processes in MPD. What we are struggling with is pushing the 50+ items into categories; Decision making; communications; team building, etc. Perhaps we need to use these different categories to approach them. Where in “A” do these items really fall? Is there a modification needed to the MPD process?

We need to be sure we don’t lose any of the brainstorm items. We would like to use these to set direction for our next series of meetings.

Do these match the four bullets we identified as our mission in our Charter? Perhaps the brainstorm items shouldn’t be used as a to-do list.

Our bookends are from concept through construction.

Rick Smith has a long list of to-dos: What of these things does this group want to take on. Most of the work Rick is doing doesn’t have to do with the Design Process per se. They do lean toward making MPD work across the agencies. Rick Smith will tell us what areas he is already looking at so this group doesn’t duplicate the efforts of others. Or Rick may have some things that no one is looking at yet that we can help with.

Action Item: Team members go back to your staff and see what is working for them and what’s not with MPD. This is in regard to the process, not the software. Ken will e-mail *Design Manual* Chapter 140 to the team.

A lessons learned database is already being worked and we should be involved with it. We need to provide input into the direction that it is heading already. Ron Pate is going out to the regions to present this and he will come to this group as well.

ADPR (Access Point Decision Report) is high on Rick’s list of items that need to be addressed. We need to look at what the *Design Manual* says and decide what it is we really want. A comment is that too many people are involved, but no one is taking responsibility. This involves the Design Office and the relationship with FHWA and developers.

Action items:

- **Team members will send handouts electronically to Adele for posting on the web. Construction and Design Manual pieces will be included in the minutes as well.**
- **Rick Smith, Mike Horton, and Amir will bring reports back to this group on approval/concurrence requirements. Then we can decide if there are areas this group can work through.**

- Adele and Ken will revise the Process Change Request form to fit this team. Use Word or a web-based form instead of Excel.
- Ken will send out a recommendation with revised checklist electronically in the new format before the next meeting.
- The team will review *Design Manual* Chapter 1425 (Access Point Decision Reports) for the next meeting.
- John Villager will send a map to Adele with directions to HDR for the next meeting.
- Team members go back to your staff and see what is working for them and what's not with MPD. This is in regard to the process, not the software. Ken will e-mail *Design Manual* Chapter 140 to the team.

Future Agenda Items:

- Added Access Point Decision Reports
- Lessons learned database - Ron Pate (October)

Next Meeting:

- The next meeting will be held in HDR's Bellevue Office 12th Floor Conference Room, on Friday, October 1, 2004.
- Darlene Sharar will present internal vs. consultant prepared APDR; Rick Door will present project experience.
- What is the Innovative Project Delivery Office working on?
- Lessons Learned Database – Ron Pate
- Review of Blue Ribbon Recommendations – Karl Winterstein

